Remarks/Arguments

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1-5 stand finally rejected as being anticipated by Frazier (U.S. Pat. No. 5,081,523). In the final office action, it is asserted in that:

> In regards to claims 1-5, Applicant argues that "Frazier is to modify the control of the beam. It does not disclose generating a pre-corrected image (comprising inverse distortion) before providing it to beam generator (Remarks 6, 8, 9)." The argument is not persuasive. Even if Frazier fails to teach the limitations above, this argument is moot because the claim language as currently stated fails to explicitly or implicitly teach this limitation."

In response to the rejection, Applicant proposes amending claim 1 to overcome the asserted deficiency of claim 1 and the dependent claims 2-5, which is the omission of language relating to "generating a pre-corrected image (comprising inverse distortions) before providing it to the beam generator." Specifically, Applicant proposes amending claim 1 to include the feature of "**providing said precorrected image to the display circuit for displaying it**." As such, this language makes it clear that the precorrected image is generated prior to the beam generator. The amendment is supported in the specification on page 6, lines 31-32, and in Fig. 4.

In other words, the solution proposed by the invention is to modify the video content of the image to be displayed (input image) in order that, when displayed by the CRT, the displayed image has no distortions (no zoom). The modification of the video

content consists of introducing inverse distortions to the image before providing it to the beam generator.

Frazier does not disclose the modification of the video content of the image to be displayed (input image) before providing it to the beam generator. The display image correction system is described at column 5, line 27 to column 7, line 4. To correct display image distortions, Frazier suggests modifying the control of the beam intensity or beam deflection of the CRT. Position and intensity correction signals are generated and used to modify the display operation. These signals are used by the image beam generator to display an image without distortions.

In sum, the solution suggested in Frazier is to modify the control of the beam. It does not disclose generating a pre-corrected image (comprising inverse distortions) before providing it to the beam generator.

In light of the above assertion that Frazier does not disclose modifying the video content, which is a key feature of Applicants' claims 1-5, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection to claims 1-5.

Conclusion:

In response to the office action, Applicants have advanced clear distinctions of the claims with respect to the cited reference; consequently, Applicants assert that the cited art does not anticipate the pending claims. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments that would facilitate the disposition or resolution of the issues, the undersigned can be contacted at 609-734-6816.

Please charge Deposit Order Account No. 07-0832 for a two-month extension.

Respectfully submitted,

Didier Doyen et al., Applicants

Richard LaPeruta, Jr.
Registration No. 51,252
Attorney for Applicant
Phone: 609-734-6816
Facsimile: 609-734-6888

Patent Operation
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

January 17, 2008